

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 12, 16, 25, 30, 31, 32, 35, 41, 44, 45 and 52 are amended. Claims 5, 15, 19, 34, 43, 47 and 51 have been cancelled. The application thus contains claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-18, 20-33, 35-42, 44-46, 48-50 and 52-56.

35 U.S.C. 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 4-7, 9-10, 15-17, 19-28, 30, 33-38, 43-54 and 56 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Blust et al. (U.S. Patent 5,544,227). Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is overcome with respect to claims 5, 15, 19, 34, 43, 47 and 51 as these claims have been cancelled and that the rejection is overcome with respect to the remaining claims due to the amendments herewith.

Independent claims 1, 25 and 30

Claims 1, 25 and 30 are amended to clarify that the first expansion interface has a bus interface operable to communicate with expansion interfaces of respective communications units on respective communication channels associated with respective said communications units, to permit any of said communications units to communicate with said wireless base station through the first wireless transceiver.

Blust et al. fails to disclose a first expansion interface having a bus interface with the capability of communicating with other communications units on communications channels associated with respective communications units. Rather, Blust et al. appear to disclose interfaces 400 and 800 that interface to trunk circuits 501 and 502, respectively, which, as is known in the art, support communications on only one channel. Blust et al. fail to describe or suggest any provisions for multiple channel communications to a plurality of communications units using a single bus interface. Consequently, there is no motivation to provide the subject matter claimed in the independent claims and therefore applicant respectfully submits the rejection is overcome.

The Examiner has rejected claims 2, 3, 8, 11-14, 18, 29, 31, 32, 39-42 and 55 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blust et al. (U.S. Patent 5,544,227). Since all of the claims dependent upon claims 1, 25 and 30 are rejected as being either anticipated or obvious in view of Blust et al., applicant submits that these claims should be allowable due to the subject matter claimed therein and due to their dependence upon claim 1, 25 or 30 which should be allowable for the reasons above.

Notwithstanding their ultimate dependence on Claim 1, claim 2 recites that the "bus interface is operable to time multiplex said communications channels" and claim 3 recites "said bus interface is operable to frequency multiplex said communications channels". Both of these claims recite subject matter that facilitates simultaneous communications with a plurality of communications units. Blust et al. appear to have failed to appreciate that this could be achieved in a system in which a bus interface is used to communicate with communications units on respective communications channels associated with said communications units. Blust et al. thus fail to provide any motivation for the claimed subject matter and therefore claims 2 and 3 are not obvious.

Claims 31 and 32 are similar to claims 2 and 3 and depend from claim 30. Claims 31 and 32 should be allowable for generally the same reasons as claims 2 and 3.

Notwithstanding its ultimate dependence upon claim 1, claim 6 recites "a first communications appliance interface operable to selectively communicate with at least one of the first wireless transceiver and said first expansion interface, to permit a communications appliance connected to said first communications appliance interface to communicate with the wireless base station or another communications unit in communication with said first expansion interface", which is not disclosed by Blust et al. The Examiner refers to Col 5, lines 41-67 however, there is no disclosure or suggestion that a communication appliance can selectively communicate with at least one of the first wireless

transceiver and said first expansion interface. It appears the communication appliance must communicate through the first expansion interface to the first wireless transceiver and selective communication with these elements is nowhere described or suggested. Consequently, there is no motivation to provide the elements claimed in claim 6 and claim 6 is neither anticipated nor obvious.

Claim 26 is similar to claim 6 and depends from claim 25. Claim 35 is similar to claims 6 and 26 and depends from claim 30. Claims 26 and 35 should be allowable for generally the same reasons as claim 6.

Notwithstanding its ultimate dependence upon claim 1, claim 9 recites "said first expansion interface and said first communications appliance interface are selectively operable to use said first wireless transceiver port". This subject matter is not disclosed or suggested by Blust et al. for the same reasons as provided above with respect to claim 6. Consequently, claim 9 is not anticipated or obvious.

Claim 37 is similar to claim 9 and depends from claim 30. Claim 37 should be allowable for generally the same reasons as claim 9.

Notwithstanding its ultimate dependence upon claim 1, claim 10 recites "said first expansion interface is operable to support independent communications between another communications unit and the wireless transceiver while supporting independent communications between another communications unit and said first communications appliance interface". The system described by Blust et al. appears to be capable of supporting only one communication at a time. Consequently, claim 10 is not anticipated and is not obvious in view of Blust et al.

Claim 38 is generally similar to claim 10 and depends from claim 30. Claim 38 should be allowable for generally the same reasons as claim 10.

Notwithstanding its ultimate dependence upon claim 1, claim 11 recites "said first expansion interface is programmable by commands received at said communications appliance interface". There is nothing in Blust et al. that suggests any component of the interface 400, which the examiner equates to the first expansion interface (see page 2, line 4 of the last paragraph in the official action), should be programmable by commands received at the communications appliance interface. How would they be received, how would the beginning and end of a command be identified and what would be programmed? Blust et al. provide no disclosure or suggestions. The Examiner asserts that PBX 500 may be programmed. If the Examiner's assertion is assumed to be correct, how would that circumstance possibly lead to programmability for interface 400? Claim 11 is not obvious in view of Blust et al.

Claims 14, 39 and 42 are similar to claim 11 and should be allowable for generally the same reasons as claim 11.

Notwithstanding its ultimate dependence upon claim 1, claim 12 recites "said first expansion interface is programmable by commands received from at least one of said first wireless transceiver port and one of said communications units". There is nothing to suggest the interface 400 should be programmable by such commands received from the indicated devices. Consequently, claim 12 is not obvious.

Claim 40 is similar to claim 12 and should be allowable for generally the same reasons as claim 12.

Notwithstanding its ultimate dependence upon claim 1, claim 13 recites "said first expansion interface is programmable to cause said first wireless transceiver port to selectively communicate with one of a plurality of communications units operable to communicate with said first expansion

interface". The Examiner has equated interface 400 with applicant's first expansion interface. Interface 400 communicates through a trunk circuit 501 with only the PBX, which the Examiner has already equated with a communication appliance interface, which is clearly differentiated from a communications unit by applicant's claims. Blust et al. fail to describe or to suggest that the expansion interface 400 should be able to selectively communicate with other communications units that would have a first wireless transceiver port and an expansion interface of the type claimed. Consequently, claim 13 is not obvious.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections in light of the amendments and arguments herewith, with a view of allowing the application.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 12-0415. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136 (a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 12-0415.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Post Office with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, POB 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

December 1, 2003

(Date of Deposit)

Corinda Humphrey

(Name of Person Signing)

Corinda Humphrey

(Signature)

December 1, 2003

(Date)

Respectfully submitted,



Richard P. Berg

Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No. 28,145

LADAS & PARRY

5670 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite
2100

Los Angeles, California 90036

(323) 934-2300